

**WASHINGTON STATE BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD
FOR KING COUNTY**

REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

February 09, 2006
12412 SE 69th Way
Bellevue, Washington

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Charles Booth convened the meeting at 7:00 P.M.

II. ROLL CALL

Evangeline Anderson	Angela Brooks
Robert Cook	A. J. Culver
Lynn Guttman	Ethel Hanis
Claudia Hirschey	Roger Loschen
Judy Tessandore	

III. INTRODUCTION OF NEW BOARD MEMBER

Claudia Hirschey, Personnel Committee Chair, introduced Robert George. Mr. George is the candidate to serve as the Special Purpose District representative to the Boundary Review Board to complete the term of Ethel Hanis. The Personnel Committee has interviewed Mr. George and recommends that the Boundary Review Board approve his appointment to the Board. Mr. George has agreed to assume service following the resignation of Ethel Hanis which will occur upon completion of the review of the proposed Fairwood Incorporation.

Action: Lynn Guttman moved and A.J. Culver seconded the motion to select Robert George to serve as representative from the Special Purpose Districts to the Boundary Review Board. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote.

IV. MINUTES

A. REGULAR MEETING:

Chair Booth presented the minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 10, 2006 for review and action by the Board members.

Action: Van Anderson and Bob Cook seconded the motion to adopt the minutes of the Regular Meeting of January 10, 2006. The Board members voted unanimously to approve this record.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

File No. 2194 Fairwood Incorporation Proposal

File No. 2197 Maplewood Addition Annexation

Ethel Hanis, Fairwood Incorporation Review Team Chair, reported that the Fairwood Incorporation Review Team met on January 26, 2006, for the purpose of reviewing the Berk & Associates' "Analysis of Fiscal Feasibility for the Proposed City of Fairwood" (Revision dated January 2006). The Team's responsibility is to determine that the citizens of this community have complete, accurate, and readily understandable data upon which to determine whether they would prefer (or decline) to incorporate as a new city.

Hanis stated that the Team has completed a review of the Berk & Associates Analysis to ensure identification of general concerns and specific issues that were to be addressed by the consultant in a revised document. Hanis reported that the Team members each stated that the revised Analysis (in combination with a Study of the Cascade Area and a Memorandum of Response) does provide sufficient information so that the various citizen communities, government officials, and decision-makers can begin to comprehend the full array of options and impacts which may occur with incorporation of a new City of Fairwood.

Hanis stated that the Fairwood Incorporation Review Team now recommends that the Board take action to accept the Analysis as being legally sufficient to enable the Board to undertake public hearings to review the proposed incorporation of a new City of Fairwood.

Blauman reported that, at present, the City of Renton continues to prefer that the proposed Maplewood Addition Annexation and the proposed Fairwood Incorporation be presented for simultaneous review before the Board so that the citizens of the area may be able to examine governance options offered by the existing City of Renton and by a proposed new City of Fairwood.

In the event that the Board accepts the recommendation of the Team to go forward with public hearings for the proposed Fairwood Incorporation and the proposed Maplewood Addition Annexation, then a specific public hearing review schedule will be presented for consideration by the Board.

Based upon the recommendation of Robert Kaufman, Special Assistant Attorney General to the Boundary Review Board, the Board would then first conduct a hearing on the City of Renton's proposed Maplewood Addition Annexation (March 20, 2006) based upon the request by the City of Renton for simultaneous review of the Maplewood Addition Annexation and the proposed Fairwood incorporation.

At the conclusion of the hearing for the Maplewood Addition, the Board may consider whether to; (1) immediately make a decision with respect to the proposed basic annexation; or (2) hold decision-making for the basic annexation until the conclusion of the hearings for the new City of Fairwood.

Additionally, if the City of Renton requests an expansion of the Maplewood Addition Annexation Area, then the Board would need to decide whether to consider such an expansion. If the Board is willing to consider expansion, then a separate public hearing would be necessary for such evaluation. That public hearing would be conducted following the public hearings for the new City of Fairwood.

Hearings for the Fairwood Incorporation proposal would take place on March 27, March 29 and March 30.

All hearings will be conducted in accord with the requirements established by RCW 35.02 (Incorporations), RCW 35A.14 (Annexations), and RCW 36.93 (Boundary Review Board Enabling Act), et seq. These requirements address legal notification, conduct of the hearings, records management, and the decision-making process.

Hanis stated that the revised Analysis (and attendant documents) will be provided to the full Boundary Review Board at this time. However, as prescribed by statutory mandate, discussion of the Analysis (and attendant documents) may not take place at this Regular Meeting. The Board must conduct a review of the Analysis (and attendant documents) only in Special Meetings/Public Hearings.

Hanis stated that government officials and citizen stakeholders will have an opportunity to both provide written statements to the record in advance of the public hearings and to testify (e.g., provide comments, raise questions) in the course of the public hearing process.

More specifically, Hanis and Blauman reported that, prior to the public hearings, government officials and citizen stakeholders will be invited by Board staff to submit information (e.g., briefings, statements, inquiries) into the official record for the Maplewood Addition Annexation and/or the Fairwood Incorporation NOI. Examples of issues which the Board members may raise at the public hearings include potential impacts of changes to local governance in Fairwood upon the greater Renton Potential Annexation Area

Blauman stated that she will communicate with stakeholders of record to encourage that all written material intended for the official record be provided in advance, so that the Board has ample time to review that material prior to the beginning of the hearing process.

A complete packet of information, including all public documents, will be delivered to the Boundary Review Board members in advance of the public hearings. The Board is permitted the opportunity to submit questions to Ms. Blauman in advance of the hearings in order to clarify or augment the materials. Blauman will notify Elissa Benson of the general content areas of those questions so that Berk & Associates may be able to more efficiently address queries in the course of the public hearings.

Further, in the course of public hearings to consider the proposed annexation and proposed incorporation, Board members may seek additional information from Berk & Associates, from government officials, from technical experts, and/or from citizen stakeholders. For example, Board members may seek additional information concerning specific fiscal matters relating to the structure and function of a new City of Fairwood in consideration of the proposed incorporation.

Government officials and citizen stakeholders will also have an opportunity to both provide written statements to the record and to provide testimony in the course of the public hearing process for Maplewood Addition and for Fairwood.

Following the public hearings for Fairwood (and hearings for the Maplewood Addition), the Board would make decisions/recommendations with respect to incorporation and/or annexation of the affected territories. The record (including the public hearings) will serve as a basis from which the Board will make a decision/recommendation with respect to the incorporation of the City of Fairwood and the Maplewood Addition Annexation.

The Board may approve the Maplewood Addition Annexation as proposed. The Board may approve the annexation with modifications to the boundaries. The Board may deny the annexation.

The Board decision is final with respect to the annexation. In the event that the Board's decision is not acceptable to the City of Renton, the City may choose to cease to move forward to annex territory or may appeal the decision of the Board to Superior Court.

With respect to the proposed new City of Fairwood, the Board may approve the incorporation as proposed. The Board may approve the incorporation with modifications to the boundaries. The Board may recommend against the incorporation.

An election is required to confirm incorporation. Therefore, following the action of the Board, the Fairwood Task Force will decide whether or not to take the proposal for incorporation to the electorate. If the proposal goes to election, the ballot must reflect the Board's decision with respect to the boundaries of the proposed City of Fairwood.

Blauman reported that a new citizens group, "A Greater Renton", has formed in the Fairwood/Cascade Area of unincorporated King County. The group intends to promote annexation to Renton of the Fairwood Area and the Cascade Area. "A Greater Renton" hosted a community information meeting on January 24, 2006. Speakers at the meeting included representatives of King County, the City of Renton, and the Fairwood Task Force.

Blauman attended that meeting to provide citizens with information concerning the role of the Boundary Review Board with respect to Notices of Intention for municipal annexations.

Blauman reported that, in the event that "A Greater Renton" does submit a Notice of Intention for annexation which includes properties currently proposed for incorporation as a new City of Fairwood, the Board would review this Notice of Intention in accord with the provisions of 36.93 RCW. As prescribed by 36.93 RCW, however, the proposal for incorporation of Fairwood must be reviewed by the Board prior to review of a proposed Notice of Intention for "A Greater Renton".

Action: A. J. Culver moved and Claudia Hirschey seconded a motion that the Boundary Review Board adopts the recommendation of the Fairwood Incorporation Review Team to accept as legally sufficient the Berk & Associates Fiscal Feasibility Analysis for the Proposed City of Fairwood (File No. 2194) and sets a Special Meeting/Public Hearing on March 27, March 29, and March 30, 2006 to consider the proposed Fairwood Incorporation. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote.

Action: Lynn Guttman moved and Angela Brooks seconded a motion that the Boundary Review Board approves the setting of a Special Meeting/Public Hearing to consider the proposed Maplewood Addition Annexation (File No. 2197) on March 20, 2006. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote.

File No 2222 – City of Renton Querin Annexation:

Chair Booth reported that the City of Renton has invoked jurisdiction for the Querin Annexation, requesting that the Boundary Review Board conduct a public hearing to consider the expansion of the Querin Annexation from 7.3 acres (as initially proposed) to include 24 additional acres (totaling approximately 31 acres).

Chair Booth requested direction from the Board with respect to the setting of a public hearing pursuant to the request by the City of Renton.

Action: Bob Cook moved and Ethel Hanis seconded a motion to direct the setting of a Special Meeting/Public Hearing for May 17, 2006 to consider the Querin Annexation (File No. 2222). The Boundary Review Board adopted this motion by unanimous vote.

VI. ORIENTATION PROGRAM:

Chair Booth introduced Elissa Benson, Senior Policy Analyst with the Office of the King County Executive and Chandler Felt, Demographer, with the Office of the Executive.

Elissa Benson will be speaking about the King County Annexation Initiative. Chandler Felt will be providing an update concerning the County's Annual Growth Report.

King County Annexation Initiative: Elissa Benson reported that the County is actively working to implement the King County Annexation Initiative. Particular emphasis has been placed on ten major areas identified in potential annexation areas of cities throughout the County. While there has been progress in numerous areas, there is much work remaining to be accomplished. More specifically:

West Hill/Skyline Area: Benson reported that the City of Renton has agreed to place the West Hill/Skyline community in its Potential Annexation Area. That designation was accomplished in December 2005. There is considerable citizen interest in joining the City of Renton; however there is no specific timeline in place to begin the process of annexation.

North Highline: Benson reported that citizens of the North Highline Area continue to have a wide variety of opinions concerning preferred future governance of their area. Some prefer annexation to Burien. Others prefer annexation to Seattle. Some citizens would prefer to incorporate as a new city. Some citizens prefer to remain in unincorporated King County.

The Burien City Council is considering an amendment of their Comprehensive Plan to add North Highline as a Potential Annexation Area. The Council is debating the issue and has postponed formal action on this matter to a date (uncertain) later this year. The City of Seattle is, similarly, considering amendment of the Comprehensive Plan to include North Highline in the Potential Annexation Area. A decision is anticipated in Summer of 2006.

On January 3, 2006 citizens of Boulevard Park, a neighborhood within the North Highline District, sent a letter to the Boundary Review Board (via Mrs. Blauman) indicating a plan to incorporate their community as the District of Duwamish (DODAH).

As of February 09, the Clerk of the King County Council reports that the official proposal has not yet been submitted to the County as required by Chapter 35.02 RCW. Upon receipt of a legally sufficient proposal, the Board will be required to set a public meeting to enable the leaders of DODAH to present their plans for the function and structure of the new City. The public meeting must take place within 30 days of receipt of that completed official proposal.

In order to create a governance plan that serves the extremely diverse populace, local governments, and King County, it will be necessary to provide a creative approach to community outreach in this area. King County officials are working with local communities to develop an inclusive public information program.

Kirkland (Finn Hill/Juanita): Benson reported that the citizens of the Finn Hill and Juanita Areas have expressed a substantial interest in annexation to Kirkland. The City wishes to annex the area but has determined a \$5.5 million gap in operations funding requirements/resources. The City is working with the County and the State of Washington to obtain the necessary funding to serve these areas.

Klahanie/Greenwood Point/South Cove Annexations: Benson reported that the City of Issaquah is proceeding with annexation of Greenwood Point/South Cove based upon the agreement of the citizens of this community to join the City and to support bonded indebtedness.

The City of Issaquah is not currently proceeding with annexation of Klahanie because, while the citizens of that area did support annexation, they rejected participation in the bonded indebtedness of the City.

The Issaquah City Council, instead, directed staff to meet with King County officials, City of Sammamish officials, and citizens of the area to consider future options for local governance. Those meetings are currently underway.

Lenora Blauman will maintain communications with County officials and City officials to determine the status of these actions.

East Renton Plateau: Benson reported that the citizens of a portion of the East Renton Plateau are working with Renton City officials to accomplish annexation of territory of approximately 1600 acres. It is anticipated that a Notice of Intention will be submitted to the Boundary Review Board in Spring 2006. There is some controversy about the proposed annexation among the residents and property owners in this area. This action may require a public hearing before the Boundary Review Board.

Kent Northeast: Benson reported that King County and the City of Kent have begun to examine opportunities for annexation of the Kent NE Potential Annexation Area. While the City would like to accomplish this annexation, there is no specific timeline for this transition as the size of the area and the costs attendant upon service of the citizens require considerable planning and the banking of necessary funds.

Renton Cascade Area: Benson stated that the City of Renton has contracted with Berk & Associates to study the governance and fiscal impacts of the potential annexation of the Cascade Area to the City of Renton. Early reports indicate that the City of Renton could manage governance and service to the Cascade Area.

Auburn Lea Hill: Benson reported that the City of Auburn is interested in annexation of the remaining Lea Hill Area. Prior to undertaking this transition, however, it is necessary for the City of Auburn, King County, and other South King County cities to work together to establish compatible planning for land uses/densities and for public facilities/infrastructure. The broad variation of permitted uses and standards for facilities/infrastructure makes it difficult to achieve uniform, efficient governance.

Annual Growth Report: Chandler Felt reported that the King County Annual Growth Report for 2005 is now in publication. This Report includes a modest level of new information. Mr. Felt briefly reviewed the Highlights of this Report. Mr. Felt also presented a King County Demographics Report that he will be providing to the Master Builders' Association. Mr. Felt reported that:

- The Puget Sound Economy is on the upswing, with a range of traditional and new industries and services experiencing either stable economies or growing success.
- King County is experiencing substantial population growth, with 1,800,000 current residents (a gain of 230,000 persons over ten years). The population growth reflects both birth and immigration. There is increasing ethnic and racial diversity among the citizens of the region.
- The demographic profile of King County is changing over time. For example, there has been a marked increase in the number of persons over 45 years of age. There has been a marked and continuing increase in smaller households (e.g., single-person households).
- Housing – new and older homes – include a range of single-family and multi-family units. The County has sufficient land capacity to accommodate 2022 Household Targets. However, housing availability and housing affordability (both market rate and low income) continue to be a major issue for residents of King County and the greater Puget Sound. For example, the housing market must make changes to accommodate changing housing needs (e.g., single-person households; larger households for newcomers to the country).
- The King County Benchmarks Analysis finds that both King County's population growth and the growth of jobs in the area are consistent with growth targets established in the King County Comprehensive Plan developed under the aegis of the Growth Management Act.

VII. ADMINISTRATION

A. CHAIR'S REPORT

General Business:

Chair Charles Booth and Lenora Blauman reported that the Board is currently working on several projects including: (1) coordinating programs with King County Executive/Council Work Program; (2) coordinating activities with the State Association to establish Work Program at Legislature 2006; (3) administration of the proposed Fairwood Incorporation; (4) pre-development review for future Notices of Intention; and (5) monitoring of the Year 2006 Budget. Committee members and staff will report on these activities.

B. Committee Reports

Legislative Committee: Charles Booth and Lenora Blauman reported that the House Local Government Committee and the Senate Government Operations Committee are underway conducting substantive review for legislation addressing the Growth Management Act and related topical issues.

The State Association met in Olympia on January 23 – 25, 2006. Association representatives visited with key legislators on the House Local Government Committee and on the Senate Government Operations Committee. Those Committees will review legislation germane to boundary review boards.

The House and/or Senate had agreed to consider several bills of interest to boundary review boards. The State Association has directly established positions with respect to a number of these bills. King County has also established positions (in consultation with our Board) with respect to these bills. More specifically:

HB 3123: This bill redefines an “island” of unincorporated area to include areas of more than 100 acres with only 60% contiguous to a city boundary (Section 1 and Section 3). It also increases the number of signatures required to initiate a referendum election on the matter (Section 2 and Section 4). Currently only parcels that are less than 100 acres in size and share 80% of boundaries with an adjacent city can be annexed into that city by resolution of the City Council (no property owner or voter approval necessary.)

The State Association supports a public review process for annexations. The increase in the size of an “island” does not support the public review/participation process. However, the WSBRB reported to the House Local Government Committee an interest in working with legislators to modify this portion of the bill to address interests of governments and citizens.

The second feature of the bill raises the percentage required to initiate a referendum vote on an annexation from 10% to 25%. This is the feature of the existing “island” annexation law that has permitted citizens to undertake voting related to annexations. Increasing the threshold will reduce likelihood of a citizen vote. However, this change will streamline accomplishment of annexations by cities. Therefore, the Association took a neutral position with respect to the proposed 25% requirement for a referendum.

The bill was heard by the House Local Government on February 1. AWC supported this bill. The Fire District expressed concerns about the change in requirements for a referendum. The Committee referred this bill to the House Rules Committee by a vote of four “in favor” and 3 opposed. A minority report was prepared to state objections to the legislation. The bill remains inactive in the House Rules Committee as of this writing.

HB 3140: This bill intended to limit the Boundary Review Board’s ability to increase the size of city annexations to one hundred percent or less. This bill was introduced to prevent a proposed annexation of the City of Vancouver in Clark County where the Boundary Review Board was asked to consider increasing an annexation by significantly greater acreage.

The bill would have limited the ability of the boundary review board to expand the acreage of a proposed annexation even when such expansion is consistent with the Board’s statutory mandate and when a local government is seeking (and has the available resources) to serve the citizens. Faster growing counties (King, Pierce, Snohomish, etc.) appreciate the authority that the Boundary Review Board has in expanding annexations to include more unincorporated urban growth areas. Under current law, other counties are not required to expand annexations beyond the threshold proposed under HB 3140.

The Association does not support HB 3140 as it is currently crafted, but reported that the group would be pleased to work with the Legislature to amend this bill to address the interests of various counties.

The bill was heard by the House Local Government on February 1. The Committee took no action on this bill; therefore, it is no longer viable for this Session.

HB 3163: This bill would have created parity of “special districts” (i.e. fire protection and water-sewer districts) with cities for purposes of GMA, including: coordination on countywide planning policies, plan consistency, ability to appeal countywide policies, and subject to sanctions. Also adds “water supply” and “sanitary sewer service” to definition of “public services.” States cities and special districts are most appropriate to provide urban services.

This bill would have served to bring fire districts and water and sewer districts under the provisions of GMA. Two potential areas of concern were identified. First, by giving special districts parity as an appropriate provider of urban services (RCW 36.70A.110 (4)) the bill could have diminished cities’ abilities to assume special districts and perpetuate the problems of multiple taxing districts. Second, because special districts often serve areas outside of UGA’s this bill could have encouraged the creation of more fully contained communities (RCW 36.70A.350) that would be served by special districts, but not by cities. The designation of fully contained communities would continue to rest with counties.

The Washington State American Planning Association Chapter Legislative Platform supported:

- Requiring that special purpose districts be fully integrated into the Growth Management Act
- Promoting legislative action to unify special interest districts (in a manner similar to “unified school districts”) or to require them to merge into cities, especially in urban areas. Multiple layers of government are not good government

The AWC legislative bulletins make no mention of this bill. The water and sewer district association website provided no information concerning a position on this bill. The Washington Fire Commissioners Association supports the bill.

The Boundary Review Board for King County (and the Washington Chapter of the American Planning Association recommended in favor of HB 3163 with the above-proposed revisions. The State Association took no position on this bill.

This bill was heard by House Local Government on February 1. The Committee took no action on this bill; therefore, it is no longer viable for this Session.

HB 3260: This bill amends RCW 36.93.230 to require voter approval to authorize boundary review board disbanding. Under current law, the county legislative authority may disband boards when a county and the cities and towns within the county have adopted a comprehensive plan and consistent development regulations. This bill would remove that authority from the legislative body and place authority to disband boards with the voters.

This bill was crafted in response to the action by the Clark County Council to disband the Clark County Boundary Review Board.

Initially HB 3260 also was also crafted to reinstate the Clark County Boundary Review Board by declaring null and void the disbanding of boundary review board which occurred on or after January 1, 2006. However, the bill has been amended to remove this provision.

The Boundary Review Board for King County and the State Association have indicated to the Legislature appreciation for the support created through this bill for the role of the boundary review boards of the State of Washington.

This bill was heard by the House Local Government Committee on February 1. As the bill was generated in response to issues in Clark County, the primary speakers were from the City of Vancouver (in support of the bill) and representatives of Clark County (opposing the bill). The Committee forwarded this bill to the House Rules Committee. The bill remains inactive in the House Rules Committee as of this writing.

SB 6521 This bill creates a new direct property owner petition method of annexations for cities and towns. More specifically, this bill will enact a new direct property owner petition method for annexations. This bill also provides for owners of tax exempt properties to petition for annexation and modifies the means by which the property value/indebtedness is calculated for the annexation process. The bill also modifies definitions of co-terminus boundary lines for determination of areas permitted to be included in annexation petitions. Finally, the bill includes provisions for taxation of properties incorporated by annexation.

The Boundary Review Board for King County and the Association takes no position on this bill because the proposed legislation does not affect authorities or responsibilities of the Boundary Review Board for King County or the WSBRB.

The State Association Lobbyist Michael Shaw, Michael Marchand, Charles Booth, and Paul Perz (Thurston County) will continue to represent the State Association in Olympia through this Session.

C. Executive Secretary's Report

Schedule of Events – Spring 2006: Lenora Blauman reviewed the Schedule of Regular Meetings, Special Meetings, Public Hearings and other events planned for Spring 2006. Blauman requested that each Board member immediately notify her of unavailable dates in order to enable staff to ensure a quorum for every required meeting.

State Association Spring Workshop: Blauman reported that the State Association has slated its Spring Workshop for Wednesday May 10, 2006. The Association is planning a program which includes a variety of topical issues. Board members are encouraged to attend this event.

D. CORRESPONDENCE

General correspondence was reviewed briefly. No questions or issues were raised with respect to the substance of the general correspondence.

VIII NEW BUSINESS

B. NOTICES OF INTENTION

File No. 2225 Coal Creek Utility District: The Coal Creek Utility District proposes to annex approximately 136.5 acres of land within Unincorporated Rural King County. The District initiated this annexation proposal based on a petition by property owners. The purpose of the annexation is to permit the Coal Creek Utility District to extend water service to the area to serve existing homes and future permitted residential development. No sewer service will be provided because this service is not permitted in the Rural Area. The proposed annexation area is addressed in the Coal Creek Utility District Plan.

File No. 2226 Highline Water District: The Highline Water District proposes to annex approximately 98.2 acres within the City of SeaTac. The Highline Water District initiated this annexation proposal based on a petition by property owners. The Highline Water District already provides water service to the 2005-1 Area. Annexation will also provide residents an opportunity to participate in elections for the Highline Water District. The proposed annexation area is addressed in the Highline Water District Plan.

C. PENDING FILES

Auburn	Bellevue	Issaquah
Kirkland	Redmond	Renton (4 files)
Ronald Sewer District	Sammamish	Soos Creek District
SW Suburban Sewer District	Tukwila	Woodinville

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Action: *Angela Brooks moved and Bob Cook seconded a motion to adjourn the Boundary Review Board Regular Meeting. The Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 9:05 P.M.*

WASHINGTON STATE BOUNDARY REVIEW BOARD FOR KING COUNTY

MEETING SCHEDULE – SPRING 2006

PLEASE NOTE REVISED MEETING DATES

- March 9** **Regular Meeting**
- March 20** **Special Meeting/Public Hearing: Maplewood Addition Annexation (File No. 2197)**
- March 27** **Special Meeting/Public Hearing: Fairwood Incorporation (File No. 2194)**
- March 29** **Special Meeting/Public Hearing: Fairwood Incorporation (File No. 2194)**
- March 30** **Special Meeting/Public Hearing: Fairwood Incorporation (File No. 2194)**
- Please note that there is no meeting on March 28*
- April 03** **Special Meeting: Board Deliberates to Come to A Preliminary Decision on Maplewood Addition**
- (Please note that this meeting will occur only if the Board declines to consider an expanded Maplewood Addition)*
- April 20** **Regular Meeting**
- (Please Note that there is no Regular Meeting on April 13)*
- May 3** **Special Meeting/Public Hearing: Maplewood Addition Annexation Expanded (File No. 2197)**
- (Please note that this meeting will only occur if the Board agrees to consider a request by the City of Renton to expand Maplewood Addition)*
- May 4** **Continued Special Meeting/Public Hearing: Maplewood Addition Annexation Expanded (File No. 2197)**
- (Please note that this meeting will only occur if the Board agrees to consider a request by the City of Renton to expand Maplewood Addition)*
- May 10** **State Association Workshop in Ellensburg**
- May 11** **Regular Meeting**
- May 15** **Special Meeting: Board Deliberates to Come to Preliminary Decisions on Fairwood/Maplewood Addition Expanded**
- May 17** **Special Meeting/Public Hearing: City of Renton Querin Annexation (File No. 2222)**
- May 22** **Special Meeting/Public Hearing: City of Renton Querin Annexation (File No. 2222)**
- (Please note that this meeting will only occur if the Board agrees to consider a request by the City of Renton to expand the Querin Annexation)*
- June 8** **Regular Meeting –**
- **Final Decision on the Fairwood Incorporation (File No. 2194)**
 - **Final Decision on City of Renton Maplewood Addition Annexation (File No. 2197)**
 - **Final Decision on City of Renton Querin Annexation (File No. 2222)**